

MAY 31 2001

010327

KALYNDA TILGES: My name is Kalynda, K-a-l-y-n-d-a, last name Tilges, T-i-l-g-e-s. I'm the nuclear issues coordinator for Citizen Alert in Las Vegas, Nevada. Comments are a little scattered. I'll try to keep them fairly coherent.

1 A quick comment. You may have noticed that there's not as many people as you might expect here tonight, and that's because the Department of Energy has scheduled this hearing in conflict with a very important Amargosa town hall meeting. A lot of the people who would like to be here tonight can't, and I would request formally that the Department of Energy take more consideration into what's going on locally when they schedule their meetings. My understanding is local people aren't very happy about it. I wouldn't be either.

I'd also like to formally request an extension of time for comments on this. There again there's no reason why there shouldn't be. We need another 45 days. We will be -- Citizen Alert will be entering formal comments, and you can expect to see me at the next two hearings again, and I will be speaking at them.

Again, to go on Susi's point, this is a national program. We've seen a great deal of national interest; and therefore, the Supplement DEIS should be presented in national public hearings.

Also, hearings should be held in every county in Nevada. Why are they limited to Amargosa, Pahrump and Las Vegas? Nevada has two major population centers, and the people in rural areas being no less worthy than those in urban areas have just as much right to express their opinions on these documents on the record in a convenient local public hearing.

Also, much of the information available at these hearings, such as here at the nice poster session out there, is not available to anyone other than at these hearings. While the DOE is questionably upholding its legal responsibilities, according to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as far as holding hearings in the vicinity of Yucca Mountain, this is another example of the Department of Energy failing to uphold its moral and ethical responsibility to the public.

2 I'm very concerned that there's so much talk about water flow. It's very disconcerting to me that there is so much design fortification around water issues when the DOE talks about Yucca Mountain being so dry and the perfect place for waste. It's confusing to me.

Also along with the extension period is we're commenting on this: The Supplement to the draft DEIS. But in this document when you order this for this hearing to comment on it, you find out that it references this

document, and the original Draft Environmental Impact Statement which I didn't even want to try to bring tonight, okay. I find that a little disingenuous at best.

- 3 [According to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission the Department of Energy must have a final site design for the license application. The site recommendation is much more important than the license application because this is what the President will make his determination on on whether or not to recommend Yucca Mountain to Congress.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement must be as clear as the nuclear regulatory license application and must indicate a final design choice. This Supplement does nothing to achieve that.

On page 2-20 of the SDEIS we're talking about subsurface facilities presented. This assumes to use an area which hasn't even been investigated yet. Surface facilities as presented in this couldn't even get a license if this were a reactor site.

- 4 [The scope of this Supplement is not broad enough to address all the comments made on the DEIS. The scope should have been much broader to sufficiently update information that was already commented on in the DEIS. It should have addressed many insufficiencies such as the incorrect employment figures in Nye County, transportation and comments which were made but never responded to on the Draft DEIS.

The public needs responses to all its comments before the Final EIS can be released. The supplemental DEIS intensifies the fact that the entire Environmental Impact Statement from beginning to end needs to be redone.

- 5 [I met with Ron Milner in OCRWM in Washington, D.C. a few weeks ago, and we were told to our face that all the comments that were made, over 11,000 comments on the Draft EIS, would not be responded to until the Final EIS, on which there will be no hearings. The next hearings -- the last hearings that will be held will be the site recommendations. So no one is going to get any answers to their questions until it goes to Congress. This isn't right.

- 6 [You talk about reducing uncertainties. How about eliminating the uncertainties? Other countries have worked on the supposition that they should find out how a repository should actually work to protect the public in the manner it needs to be protected. Once they get those rules down, just as an example Germany has said zero release for a million years. Once they put those rules in place then they will find a site to match those rules. The Department of Energy has selected -- excuse me, Congress. This country has selected a site and now we're making the rules to fit. I find that wrong, and wrong.

- 7 | Section 3.1.1 talks about how the DOE would obtain permanent control of the land surrounding the repository site, yet it makes no mention of how it plans to own that area. The area in question, in fact, all of Yucca Mountain is currently owned by the Western Shoshone Nation under the 1863 Treaty of Ruby Valley, who oppose this project vehemently.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission requires the Department of Energy to prove ownership of the land it plans to use, yet the Department of Energy does not have ownership. Permanent control cannot be proved without legal title to these lands, and I don't see that the Department of Energy will get that. |

- 8 | And once again I'd simply like to reiterate with all the uncertainties and with all the conflicts in this that the entire Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the whole EIS procedure needs to be redone completely. |